

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

JANE DOE, an individual

Plaintiff,

v.

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF NORTH  
AMERICA,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:24-CV-00859-NW

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING  
JOINT ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION  
FOR LEAVE TO FILE THE  
ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD UNDER  
SEAL

Judge: Hon. Noël Wise  
Ct. 3, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor

Complaint Filed: February 13, 2024

Having reviewed the Joint Administrative Motion for Leave to File the Administrative Record Under Seal, and for good cause shown, the Court hereby GRANTS the Joint Administrative Motion for Leave to File the Administrative Record, Bates stamped LINA-Doe-000001 through LINA-Doe-002533, under seal.

The Court finds that the vast majority of the Administrative Record, which contains Plaintiff's name, social security number, address, date of birth, medical information, and financial information, is entitled to protection under the law. *See* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 5.2 (requiring redaction of social security number, taxpayer identification number, birth date, name of an individual known to be a minor, financial account number), 2007 Advisory Committee Notes ("The rule is adopted in compliance with rules 'to protect privacy and security concerns relating to electronic filing of

documents and the public availability ... of documents filed electronically.” (internal quotations omitted).

Further, the strong presumption of access to judicial records is rebutted due to the privacy concerns presented. *See Gallegos v. Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, Order Granting Motion to Seal, Case No. 5:16-cv-01268-BLF, Doc. No. 41, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2017) (“The Court finds that the ‘compelling’ standard applies... Because the majority of documents in the administrative record contain Plaintiff’s confidential personal information, they are appropriately sealable”); *see also Sullivan v. Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 2012 WL 3763904, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2012) (“[t]he parties’ joint representations that the Administrative Record is ‘replete’ with personal, identifying information in violation of Rule 5.2(a), and that redacting such information would be too burdensome, is considered sufficient to justify granting the parties’ request under the good cause standard”). The Court has taken Plaintiff’s pseudonym in this case into account in issuing this Order.

The Parties’ opening and responsive briefs under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52 shall not be filed under seal and the parties are not prohibited from citing to any of the documents in the record that discuss Plaintiff’s medical conditions. If either party’s briefs rely on documents in the Administrative Record that do not disclose Plaintiff’s personal identifying information or her medical information, such as insurance contracts or plan documents, those documents shall be filed in the public record as separate exhibits to the parties’ briefs in addition to being lodged with the Court.

///

///

**IT IS SO ORDERED**

Dated: May 14, 2025

  
 Hon. Noël Wise  
 United States District Judge